



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

hundred days seems a long time for an illness to incubate. But in the early Babylonian contracts the time allowed for the bennu was "one month." There it is associated with *tepitum*, which is allowed one to three days. This was in the case of female slaves, who were thus sold on trial. The buyer could not send back the slave after three days on the ground that she had any organic deficiency. The *sartu* here is any "blemish" such as justified the return of a slave. That could be pleaded any time. So the code of Hammurabi enacted that a slave could be sent back on proof of a *bagru*, or cause of complaint. The clause is a guarantee on the part of the seller that the slave has no undisclosed defect. It is a stock phrase and condensed by omission of the apodosis. So, often, we read *ša pi duppi šuati unakkaru*, "who shall pervert the tenor of this document," but the fate in store is not set down. In the phrase quoted from III R. 49, No. 3, 32, the sentence reads in full, *ša sinništi, ištu pāni sarte, kātā šibti, ḥabulli, Karmeuni šū amēlu urkiu*, "for the woman, against any defect, seizure of the hands (or) injury, Karmeuni he is guarantee." The "seizure of the hands," like *šibit pi*, "seizure of the mouth," means a seizure which renders them useless.

The notes on the text are always helpful and suggestive though finality is out of the question yet on account of the lacunæ and for want of parallels. Here and there a small typographical error occurs and there are one or two oversights. On p. 138, אִלְתּוּ is for *amiltu* rather than *amelutu*. In No. 35, line 1, for *ina māti išu* read *ina sat-tuk*. The *asnê* seem to be a sort of date fruit, brought from Dilmun (ZA., XII, p. 408 f.). On p. 130, the *belit* tree is better read *tillit* and seems to be a variant of *tillatu*, a grape vine.

The translations are well done with the present state of knowledge; the cuneiform texts seem to be the most reliable yet produced, and there is a very useful register of proper names. Altogether it is a most useful and careful piece of work.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

QUEENS' COLLEGE,
Cambridge.

FOSSEY'S LA MAGIE ASSYRIENNE.¹

Since the days of Lenormant's work (*Études Accadiennes*, 1873-1880; *Die Magie und Wahrsagekunst der Chaldäer*; improved and enlarged German edition, Jena, 1878) no attempt has been made to produce an exhaustive treatise on Babylonian Magic, although many texts dealing with this subject have been published. The present carefully edited book cannot fail, therefore, to be a welcome contribution to our knowledge of this important and interesting branch of Assyriology. Dr. Fossey,² who has dedicated his work to the veteran Jules Oppert,

¹ LA MAGIE ASSYRIENNE. Étude suivie de Textes Magiques transcrits, traduits et commentés par C. Fossey, Docteur-ès-Lettres (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études; Sciences Religieuses. Quinzième Volume). Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1902. Pp. 1-474.

has realized and endeavored to respond to the need of a thorough and systematic classification of the data on this subject.

The book is really divided into five sections, of which the first (pp. 1-11) contains the introduction and the first chapter on the sources (pp. 13-20). The second section, which is designated Part First by the author, treats exhaustively of the aim and object of the ancient Assyro-Babylonian magic (pp. 21-64); viz., chap. ii (pp. 24-41), "Demons;" chap. iii (pp. 42-51), "Sorcerers and Sorceresses;" chap. iv (pp. 52-64), "Spells; Maladies." The third section, called the Second Part by the author (pp. 65-121), deals with the actual practice of magic; viz., chap. vi (pp. 70-74), "Purification Rites; Ablutions and Fumigations;" chap. vii (pp. 75-81), "Rites to Destroy Disease;" chap. viii (pp. 82-87), "Rites for Transmission of Disease;" chap. ix (pp. 88-92), "The Magical Pharmacopeia;" chap. x (pp. 93-103), "Oral Rites; Incantations and Imprecations;" chap. xi (pp. 104-121), "Preventive Rites; Amulets and Talismans." The fourth division of the work (the author's Third Part, pp. 122-143) is devoted to the relations which existed between magic and religion; viz., chap. xii (pp. 122-134), "The Gods in Magic;" chap. xiii (pp. 135-143), "Conclusion; Magic, Religion, and Science." The fifth and last section of the work presents forty-six magical texts in transliteration and with translation (pp. 144-462), together with a few notes (pp. 463-474), and additions and corrections (p. 475).

Fossey has pointed out the main distinction between the Egyptian and Assyro-Babylonian religious systems. The life of ancient Egypt seems to us now to have been absolutely dominated by the idea of death. Preparation for the perpetuation of the soul or "double" in an after life was the Egyptians' chief care. In Babylonia and Assyria, on the other hand, we find a much more virile religious tone. Their theologians had comparatively little interest in setting forth theories regarding the condition of man after death. Welfare in the present life was their theme and the object of their solicitude. This accounts for the fact, therefore, that practically their whole system was a series of preventions against the woes of the flesh. The chief document which we have on the subject of the dead, "The Descent of Ishtar to Hades," is a mere didactic description of the other world; an edifying history, which probably arose, in order to justify and extol the annual ceremonies in honor of Tammuz. Indeed, the description of the lower world, whither Ishtar goes to recover her lost lover, is merely an episode in the poem. Prevention and cure were the double purpose of the Babylonian magic; prevention against the encroachment of malignant human sorcerers as well as against the army of malevolent demons, whose special province was the affliction of mankind with disease, and the cure of that disease, when their preventive measures failed. There was no such thing as a practice of medicine, although the Babylonians had the beginnings of a pharmacopeia, chiefly vegetable, which was used only in connection with the all-important rites. Fossey discusses this point quite fully, pp. 88-92.

² Author also of *Syllabaire Cunéiforme* and *Grammaire Assyrienne* (in collaboration with V. Scheil).

His summary of the different forms of magical rites given above in the list of the chapters practically covers the ground. It should be noted, in connection with the rites for the destruction of disease, that they practiced the custom of making an image of the offending sorcerer or demon which was then burned, thrown in the river or buried. It is hardly necessary to point out that this superstition was known in our own mediæval magic.

It was but a step from this form of incantation to the rites of transmission, whereby the disease was removed bodily from the patient by a physical act. In some cases the image of the sorcerer was placed in a bowl in which the patient's hands were washed. If the illness had been caused by a demon, or if the person of the sorcerer were not known, the waters in which the patient had washed were thrown out in an *open space* and the charm was thus absorbed by the earth, unless, indeed, it might pass to some unwary traveler who chanced to walk over the spot. Fossey renders the word which I translate "open space" by "cross-road" (*carrefour*, p. 83). Although this Assyrian word *ribîtu* might be regarded as a derivative from the same stem as the numeral "four," the Sumerian word in this passage (IV, 16, 52, 53a) means a great place (*tar-dagal-la*), pointing to a derivative from *rabû*, "be great."

A number of details in Fossey's work require a careful examination. Thus, pp. 85-86, the author distinctly rejects my view of the text, *ASKT.*, No. 12, which he translates in full pp. 450-456. In *JAOS.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 1-22 (1900), I presented translations with commentary of *ASKT.*, pp. 104-106 (the unilingual inscriptions, *K.* 138 and *K.* 3232), which I believe set forth the rite for transmitting a disease from a human being to some horned animal. This idea was suggested to me by the passage, *ASKT.*, p. 105, l. 37, *bir-ghul-dub-ba šu-u-me-ti*; l. 38, *saga-bi sag-ga-na u-me-ni-gar*; l. 39, *lugal-e tur dingir-ra-na u-me-te-gur-gur*. This can only mean: "Take the *ghulduppû* (animal with long horns, cf. *JAOS.*, Vol. XXI, p. 7); place its head on his (the patient's) head. From the king, the son of his god (ritualistic formula for 'patient') destroy it" or "drive it away." Fossey admits the superimposition of the animal's head on the patient's (p. 453), but renders *gur* (l. 39) by "purify," *i. e.*, "the patient." The question then hinges on the meaning of *gur* = *dapâru*, "destroy, tear away, do away with," never "purify" (used, *e. g.*, of sin, *K.* 4931, rev. 7, 8), and on the rendering of *-na*, the Sumerian suffix. That *-na* can mean *ana* is amply shown, *Br.* 1587, and I see, therefore, no reason to change my Assyrian rendering of the line: *ana šarri mâr îlišu dupirma*. If *lugal-e tur dingir-ra-na* be regarded as the object of *umete-gur-gur* the translation would be "destroy" or "drive away the patient," as Fossey's translation "purify" seems impossible! The *-na* here probably has the double force of a postposition *ana* and of the suffix 3d pers. sing. *-šu*; *tur dingir-ra-na* = *ana mâr îlišu*. This is the reverse of the phenomenon of conflation seen, for example, *ASKT.*, 98, 99, l. 43: *bar-ta-bi-šû (ku)* = *ina axâti*, where *-ta-* and *-šû (ku)* =

ina. This last passage is, I think, absolute proof that the postpositional element may occasionally precede the suffix, as in *ASKT.*, 105, l. 32, tu-tu-da-na, which I render "in her incantations" (ina sipâtiša), to which Fossey objects, pp. 473, 474. Owing to lack of space, the details of this discussion must be reserved for a special article, but it may be added that in IV, 26, No. 6, 22 *sqq.*, the expressions: urîga ana napištišu ittadin; qaqqad urîçi ana qaqqad amêli ittadin, etc., "the urîçu has been given for his life, the head of the urîçu has been given for the head of the man"—are not contradictory to my view, as Fossey thinks (p. 86). This text deals with the sacrifice of an urîçu, as Fossey points out, but he does not lay sufficient stress on the fact that the urîçu is here the ritualistic representative of the patient, although he renders "le mouton, l'image de l'homme." Here we have simply the sacrifice of the animal to remove evil influences; viz., the entire animal for the life of the man, and then the parts are carefully specified; *i. e.*, head for head, neck for neck, breast for breast. This is quite a distinct rite from that of the scapegoat in *ASKT.*, 105, although the general idea is similar. The sacrificial animal by its death removes the disease from the patient, *i. e.*, the animal's death takes the place of the patient's death. It is surely not necessary to strain the imagination, in order to see parallel usages to the ancient Hebrew customs in these inscriptions, and there is hardly sufficient justification for Dr. Fossey's slur in this connection regarding "so many Assyriologists' finding the whole Bible in the Assyrian texts" (p. 86).

Finally, I note that in *ASKT.*, No. 11 (pp. 86-89), col. ii, 16-20, Fossey translates as follows:

16. ud-diš ga-ba-da-an-ku = ša ūma lūkul "tout le jour que je mange."
17. ud-diš ga-ba-da-an-nak = ša ūma lūšti "tout le jour que je boive."
18. ud-diš ga-ba-da-an-na = ša ūma luġlal "tout le jour que je dorme."
19. ud-diš ga-ba-da-an-zal = ša ūma luštabri "tout le jour que je sois fort."
20. ghe-em-ma-an-gaba-a = lū tappat̃tar "tout le jour que je sois mis en pièces."

Line 20 seems to me to make no sense in this rendering. The inscription appears to mean: "Whensoever I eat; whensoever I drink; whensoever I rest; whensoever I am satisfied; O make it free from sin!" This is the usual sense of paṭāru in such passages: *cf.* mamitsu pušurma mamitsu puṭurma, IV, 7, 35, 36a, used of a curse; IV, 8, 12a, of loosening sin and wrath (*K.* 2866, 34, 36, 42, etc.).

It would have been much better if the author had printed his text numbers at the head of each page as well as the references which are already there. A list of the texts discussed with page references and a Sumer-Assyrian glossary would also have aided the student greatly.

Dr. Fossey's work is a most interesting attempt to translate a number of extremely difficult and obscure inscriptions. Although he has certainly not said the last word on many points, the book merits a place of honor in every Assyriological library.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.